



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Ives, and called it Whitelocke's Coranto; which being cried up, was first played publicly by the Blackfryars Musicke, *who were then esteemed the best of common musitians in London*. Whenever I came to that house (as I did sometimes in those days, though not often) to see a play, the musitians would presently play Whitelocke's Coranto; and it was so often called for, that they would have it played twice or thrice in an afternoon." From Sir Henry Herbert's Manuscript we learn that this band of musicians, which played at the Blackfriars and at the Globe, paid to the Master of the Revels an annual fee of £1 for license. In *The Actors' Remonstrance* (1643) we find playhouse musicians in general referred to as: "Our Musicke that was held so delectable, that they scorned to come to a Taverne under twentie shillings salary for two hours."

The chapter on "Musical Instruments and their Uses," accompanied by excellent illustrations of the more common musical instruments of the time, will prove of special value to students of Elizabethan drama. Other chapters deal with "Elizabethan Music and Its Share in the Drama," and "Some Literary Allusions to Music in Elizabethan Plays." A useful bibliography is appended. The author promises a later and fuller treatise on this subject, and states that he publishes now "in order to report progress." We hope that he will carry out his promise, and that in the meantime he will have the opportunity to fulfill a wish expressed in his Preface: "I should have liked to read and ransack every play of the period for material, but alas, I had not time enough for this."

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

UNIVERSITY DRAMA IN THE TUDOR AGE, by Frederick S. Boas. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1914.

Among the many books and articles of recent years helping to round out our still fragmentary knowledge of the forces that contributed to the passing of medieval morality and farce and the rise of the great romantic and poetic drama of Shakespeare and his fellows, I doubt whether any is of greater value to the student than *University Drama in the Tudor Age* by Professor F. S. Boas. The rich and varied repertory of the academic stage traced for us here in detail had become somewhat familiar through the studies of Professors Churchill and Keller in the Shakespeare *Jahrbuch*, of Professor Boas himself in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, and of Professor Moore Smith in his reprints of Latin plays. But though the present volume is in large part a repetition of facts already published, the data had been so scattered that the best informed found difficulty in following the history of university drama. Professor Boas has gathered the mass of scattered infor-

mation on the subject and added material that gives perspective and enables the average student to grasp the significance of the work of the university playwrights.

The author's treatment of his material is in some respects ideal. He gives a clear and full statement of what is known in regard to the drama of Oxford and Cambridge to the end of Elizabeth's reign, ample analyses of the plots of all the extant plays, and accounts of sources and relations. All this is of permanent value, and the volume will probably long remain an important reference work on account of the inaccessibility of most of the plays and the inability of many students to read sixteenth century Latin fluently. Besides, many interesting passages expressive of the playwright's critical attitude or typical of the humor and jesting, the pageantry and song, of the university stage are skilfully woven into the accounts of the plots. For example, the discussion of the unities (p. 28) in the preface of Grimald's *Christus Redivivus*, published in 1543, antedates Sidney's discussion by nearly half a century. A word should be said, also, of the engaging fashion in which Professor Boas criticises the various plays from the point of view of literary value; here his real sympathy with his work is revealed.

The greatest shortcoming of the volume is its too limited scope. The author, rather modestly, has not emphasized the significance of his field or stressed a number of broad generalizations that urge themselves upon the reader. "With the imperfect materials at our command," he declares, "all generalization is difficult, and is liable to be overthrown by fresh evidence" (p. 346). There is occasion for regret, however, that one who knows so much of university drama has not seen fit to discuss its relation to the great general development of English drama in the sixteenth century. Dramatic productions at the universities probably played no mean part in the spread of humanism—in the naturalization among the English of its aspiring and aristocratic temper, in the development and application of its critical tenets, and in the domestication of classic and foreign types of drama. It is difficult, of course, to discuss relations so complex, particularly since the classification of drama on the basis of university production is a somewhat artificial one. But though the Tudor dramatist's adaptation of classical structure, technique, and material was merely one of the results of humanism, which manifested itself alike in universities, schools, inns of court, and court, the universities in all probability formed the center of the movement and furnished the laboratory which trained the workers in the field.

One impression gained from the material which Professor Boas presents is that dramatic activity at the universities showed remarkable breadth and vitality. The academic interpretation of humanism might conceivably have forced the drama into some such barren formalism as Italy experienced; for the constant tendency of the scholar was toward a rigid formulation of rules, as one may

judge from Ascham's account of Watson's *Absalon*. But whatever the cause, the history of university drama reveals a spirit of liberalism. Most significant is the temper of the men who were the exponents of classical technique. According to Grimald (p. 28), his Oxford tutor in praising *Christus Redivivus*, 1543,—“Bellè uidelicet me temporum ordine ad finem decurrisset,” says Grimald—commended a romantic type of art, and even defended the violation of the unity of time on the ground of classical precedent. Gager claims liberty in handling the material of his *Meleager*, 1582 (pp. 167, 168), and prefaces his *Vlysses Redux*, 1592, with a still more significant profession of freedom from the rigidity of classical laws (p. 203). These passages are interesting forerunners of Jonson's criticism in *Every Man out of his Humour*, itself illustrative of the way in which extreme classicism was modified by the more virile Elizabethan taste. One of Jonson's best claims to breadth of view lies in his principle that literature must be after the fancy of the times. Certainly no phrase is more suggestive of the capacity that English writers showed for advancement in literary art, and academic as well as professional drama was evidently in accord with this principle. Drama at the universities, as its history is now presented by Professor Boas, was never long isolated from the general movements of Elizabethan drama, even though its tone was always more academic and its comedy never lost the mockery and broad burlesque appropriate to Christmas festivities, where Lords of Misrule held sway. The university stage reveals successively the popularity of mystery, morality, classical play and adaptation of classical tale and play, romantic play from Italian sources and from Chaucer, chronicle play, and satiric comedy of manners. The contribution of the universities to the field of romantic comedy in Edwards and the later Cambridge romanticists is typical. It is little wonder that Sackville was prepared to contribute so significantly to tragedy, and that Lyly, Peele, Greene, and Marlowe, fresh from the universities, effected the final crystallization of Elizabethan drama.

The university romantic plays at the end of the century, which have not been fully studied heretofore, seem to me of particular importance in this connection. Possibly in some phases they reflect the large body of lost romantic court dramas belonging to the seventies. They are full of conventional features, and, as Professor Boas points out, frequently do not follow their Italian sources closely. Thus the author of *Hymenaeus* defends himself against the charge that he has merely decked out another's comedy in new garb by referring his plot to a tale in the *Decameron* (p. 135). Yet it is probable enough that an earlier adaptation of Boccaccio's story did influence the author of *Hymenaeus*. His play is not close to the Italian tale, and the added material includes such a commonplace feature as the three wooers who became a general convention of English popular comedies and not alone those adapted from

Italian sources. The later romantic drama of the universities suggests the conventionality in the sixteenth century of many motives and situations that we would naturally ascribe to Beaumont and Fletcher, Middleton, and their fellows of the Jacobean professional stage. We may have in this fact one indication that the large body of lost sixteenth century plays exhibited almost as great variety as seventeenth century comedy. The many situations of these university plays paralleled in the later plays of the London stage at least help to reveal university drama as an integral part of general Elizabethan and Jacobean drama. One very interesting parallel is found in *Silvanus*, 1597. Silvanus in his madness is represented as twisting the heads of two cats, imagining them to be Erastus and Florinda, who have wronged him (p. 302). It is quite possible that Lear's mad fancy about the cat is a reflection of this incident. Several Gullios appear in the university drama at the end of the sixteenth century, and the name seems to have been used by university playwrights before it became popular on the regular stage.

On the other hand, university drama had, as it seems to me, marked individual notes. The most interesting of these is to be found in the treatment of country and village life and pastimes. Despite a spirit of mockery, university drama presents a far more realistic picture of rural life than the regular drama, which was a London product. *Gammer Gurton's Needle* is obviously the most notable example, and I believe that *Wily Beguiled* furnishes a worthy rival. Actual English country pastimes are no doubt reflected in the wooing dance of Gager's *Riuales*. The seventeenth century *Fucus Histriomastix* is peculiarly rich in its pictures of the provincial's songs and dances connected with wooing and marriage, but a number of the sixteenth century plays discussed by Boas contain similar material. The countryman of the regular drama was likely to be presented as he appeared in London, whereas the university playwrights and audiences appreciated better the humor of the villager and countryman as he appeared in his home life, with which numbers of them were familiar.

But, aside from generalizations, an inclination to disregard all but established facts has led Professor Boas to exclude plays whose right to a place in university drama, at least, we should expect to find discussed. The old *Timon* is an example. Professor Boas disregards also the possibility that in the extant *Wily Beguiled* we have a revised form of the lost Oxford *Wylie Beguylie* of 1567. Yet all the passages in the extant play which point to a date near the end of the sixteenth century could have been added at revision, and much in the play suggests old stagecraft; while the scholar-hero and the same broad humor as in *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, with realistic touches in the portrayal of country scenes, suggest university drama.

Naturally points of varied interpretation arise. The most interesting of these concerns the authorship of *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. Professor Boas argues strongly the claims of Bridges. The problem

is purely one of balancing evidence, as Mr. Bradley recognized when he attributed the play to Stevenson. It appears to me, however, that Professor Boas makes far too little of the religious attitude of the play and of the reference to arresting "in the Kings name." These features hardly seem like "pieces of literary artifice," as Professor Boas suggests, and they tell against Bridges's authorship, for he could hardly have written a play at Cambridge before the accession of Mary, since he proceeded B. A. in 1556, whereas there is definite record of Stevenson's connection with a play in 1554, probably in English, and with plays in preceding years—in other words, in the reign of Edward VI. It seems to me that the reference to "Mr. Stevessonne play" in 1560 is less likely to be to a play by the new man of the name who was fellow at Christ's at this time than to a revival of the popular *Gammer Gurton's Needle* or of another play by the early Stevenson. It would be a striking coincidence if two men of the same name were dramatists at the same college within the space of a few years. Professor Boas regards William Stevenson as merely the manager of performances, but the phrasing would more readily, I think, be taken to indicate authorship. Certainly even management of dramatic performances gives a presumption in favor of authorship, as we may judge from the careers of Heywood, Bale, Udall, and many later dramatists. Moreover, as little as we can rely on title pages, it seems to me that as much weight ought to be attached to the title page of the 1575 edition, apparently prepared about ten years before it appeared, as to the mocking attribution of the play to Bridges in Martin Marprelate pamphlets more than thirty years after *Gammer Gurton's Needle* was written. However high an opinion Martin may have held of the "witte and invention" shown in the play, ability to fasten the authorship on Bridges would be tantamount to unveiling a skeleton in the Dean's closet, and I do not believe that Martin would have qualified his statement by "as they say," if he had been sure of the authorship. Still there must have been some report of Bridges's connection with *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. It is possible that Stevenson wrote the play in the reign of Edward VI, that it was repeated in 1560, and that Bridges had some connection with this revival, possibly revising the play slightly.

C. R. BASKERVILL.

University of Chicago.

KARL NESSLER, *GESCHICHTE DER BALLADE* von Chevy Chase. Pp. xii, 190. Palaestra CXII, Berlin, 1911.

The Palaestra series of monographs is already assuming the proportions of a library and begins to suggest the question how one is to find time to read not merely the elaborate contributions to literary history but even the specimens of literature on which they are based. The number before us is a very thorough piece of work.